



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,180	01/05/2005	Hisao Nishikawa	029650-162	7679

7590 01/16/2007  
Burns Doane  
Swecker & Mathis  
PO Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER
----------

BOUCHELLE, LAURA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3763

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/16/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/520,180	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NISHIKAWA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Laura A. Bouchelle	<b>Art Unit</b> 3763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5 and 7-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5 and 7-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/21/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross (US 4781691) in view of Melker (US 5242410). Gross discloses a stepped needle comprising a liquid container 40 capable of holding liquid therein; an injection needle 10 having a puncture section 20 capable of piercing a living body; a proximal end section 14 having outside and inside diameters greater than said puncture section; a tapered section 18; a base body 12 supporting the needle, wherein the tapered section and the puncture section protrude from the base body. The tapered section 18 facilitates passage of the needle through the body tissue (Col. 4, lines 29) See Figs. 2 and 6. Gross further discloses that the injection needle has a liquid introducing needle section that can communicate with the liquid container. See Fig. 2. The outside diameter of the proximal end 14 is 0.64-1.3 mm, the outside diameter of the puncture section 16 is .46-.64 mm, the length from the puncture section to the tapered section is 6.4-19 mm (Col. 3, line 63 – Col. 4, line 8)

Art Unit: 3763

3. Claims 1 and 4 differ from Gross in calling for the taper to have an angle ranging from 0.5 degree to 1.2 degrees. Melker teaches a dilator having a taper from the distal end 5 to the transition point 6 having an angle in the range from about 1.26 degrees to about 5.18 degrees. This taper provides a suitable degree of gentle entry into a vessel (Col. 4, lines 27-35). See Fig. 1. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the needle of Gross to have a taper of about 1.26 degrees as taught by Melker to provide a suitable degree of gentle entry into a vessel. Although Melker teaches a dilator and applicant's invention is drawn to a needle, both are elongate tubes that pass through the skin into the body, and it is the examiner's position that providing gentle entry into the vessel is the same as providing smaller puncture resistance.

4. Claims 7, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross in view of Melker as applied to claims 1, 4 above, and further in view of Hardt et al (US 5575778). Claim 7 differs from the teachings above in calling for the proximal end of the needle to include a second needle point. Hardt teaches a syringe having a needle 26 having a point at both the proximal and distal ends so that the proximal end of the needle can be inserted through the sealed septum of a container. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the needle of Gross in view of Melker to have a second point on the proximal end so that the needle can be inserted into a sealed container.

Art Unit: 3763

5. Claims 8-11, 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross in view of Melker as applied to claims 1, 4 above, and further in view of Peery (US 7063681). These claims differ from the teachings above in calling for the puncture section to comprise a first facet having an angle of 8.5 degrees and a second facet having an angle of 18 degrees. Peery teaches a puncturing device having a puncture section 40 having a first facet having an angle of 5-45 degrees and a second facet having an angle of 10-60 degrees to provide minimal tissue trauma during insertion (Col. 4, lines 55-61; Col. 5, lines 7-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Gross in view of Melker to include the two facets as taught by Peery to reduce tissue trauma upon insertion.

6. Claims 12, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross in view of Melker as applied to claims 1, 4 above, and further in view of Kaneko et al (US 6517523). Claims 12, 18 differ from the teachings above in calling for the cross-sectional angle formed between the ridges of the needle point to be 129 degrees. Kaneko teaches a needle comprising a pointed tip having a cross-sectional angle formed between the ridges to be 115-135 degrees to ensure that the resistance force at the time of sticking is as small as possible (Col. 6, lines 45-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the needle of Gross in view of Melker to include a cross-sectional angle of 129 degrees as taught by Kaneko to ensure that the resistance force at the time of sticking is as small as possible.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/19/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. Applicant argues that Melker does not teach or suggest that the taper on the dilator should also be used on the needle. The examiner finds that the Melker device seeks to solve the same problem as applicant's invention, namely gentle penetration, and the Melker reference is relied on solely for the teaching that the particular angle of the taper provides reduced resistance to penetration.

9. Applicant further argues that Gross does not disclose the tapered section providing smaller puncture resistance, or the tapered portion even puncturing tissue. Examiner directs applicant to Col. 4, lines 29-34 of the reference where it is disclosed that the tapered portion facilitates passage of the needle through the body tissue. It is examiner's position that facilitation passage through the tissue is analogous to reducing the resistance to puncture.


***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura A. Bouchelle whose telephone number is 571-272-2125. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-4.

Art Unit: 3763

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 517-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
NICHOLAS LUCCHESI  
SUPERVISOR  
TELEPHONE 517-272-4977

Laura A Bouchelle  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3763

LAB